

11. A method of movement in a game wherein the game board is comprised of spaces containing integers, and movement between two spaces containing integers is initiated by a third integer which makes up the difference of said two integers.
12. A method of playing a board game as described in claim 3, wherein the playing pieces, game board, and method of play all exist as data within a computer, and wherein at least a portion of such data is displayed on output means; said output means being comprised of a computer monitor or LCD screen.

REMARKS

By the above amendment, Applicants have amended the title to emphasize what it is that is being claimed. Originally it was unclear whether Applicants were claiming an apparatus or a method, the new title helps to clarify that Applicants regard a method and not an apparatus as their invention.

The Objection To The Claims Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 4 and 6 were previously objected to as being in the improper form of multiple dependent claims. These claims have been replaced by claims 10 and 12, which have been written to avoid ~~the~~ a form that would not classify these claims as multiple dependent claims.

The Rejection Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C

Claims 1-4, and 6 were rejected as being indefinite. Claim 1, which was replaced by claim 7, had a preamble suggesting Applicants were intending to claim an apparatus. Claim 3 had a preamble indicating Applicants were intending to claim a method. This caused confusion as to what Applicants specifically regarded as the invention. Thus, the new claims all indicate methods, due to the fact, that Applicants regard the method of play and the method by which a playable game board may be derived as their invention. Applicants have no intention of trying to regard an apparatus as their invention.

It was also stated by the examiner that Claim 1 was indefinite due to the statement that integers were considered *both* positive and negative. Applicants no longer refer to integers in this manner. Integers are now referred to as *either* positive or negative.

The Rejection Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C 102 (b)

Claim 5 was rejected as being anticipated by Cohen (2811360). Examiner pointed out that Cohen already teaches a game board having integers on spaces and that rules for playing a game do not further limit an apparatus. However, claim 10, which replaced claim 5, has been written as a method claim so that the rules described therein due further limit the claim. Upon investigation by Applicants it is their belief that no prior art exists which would have anticipated the method of game play described in claim 11.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the claims are all in proper form and the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore they submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit.

Very Respectively,


John Thomas Arana


Michael Arthur Kaiser-Mistriél

-----Applicants Pro Se -----

3358 Caminito Luna Nueva
Del Mar, CA 92014
Tel 858-792-7774

I hereby certify that on the date below, this document will be deposited with U.S. Postal Service as first class mail, in an envelope with sufficient postage, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, PO BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

JULY 29,2004


Michael Arthur Kaiser-Mistriél, Applicant